



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2024

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F3545/D/23/3331474

3 Appledown Drive, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP32 7HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs G Platt against the decision of West Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref DC/23/0911/HH, dated 9 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey side extension at 3 Appledown Drive, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk IP32 7HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/23/0911/HH, dated 9 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 23-13.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling. The site forms a corner plot at the junction between Appledown Drive and Cardinal Close with the dwelling angled towards the junction. The dwelling at No 5 Appledown Drive (No 5) has a similar design and angled positioning to the dwelling at the site. Whilst these dwellings create a spacious and attractive entrance to Cardinal Close, this is tempered by the differences in layout, including the enclosure at the site and the landscaping and wall to the side of No 5.
4. The proposal is for a single-storey side extension fronting Cardinal Close. The proposal would be visible from Cardinal Close and Appledown Drive and would reduce the space to the side of the dwelling. However, the small scale and position set back from the front elevation, would preserve the overall spacious character of the area and the architectural rhythm of development in the area.
5. The extension would be positioned adjacent to the dwelling within a part of the site outside of the enclosed rear garden. Nonetheless, the proposal would have a strong relationship with the dwelling given its physical attachment to it. The

extension would respect the scale and form of the host property and would be a subservient and sympathetic addition to the dwelling. Furthermore, the appropriate design, utilising a pitched roof, and matching material finishes of the proposal would retain the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

6. I conclude the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The development would therefore accord with Policies DM2 and DM24 of the Joint Development Management Policies Document (2015), which require proposals to respect the character, scale and design of existing dwellings and the wider surrounding area and the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires proposals to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty.
8. A condition was suggested requiring the materials to be used to match those of the existing dwelling. The plans state that the materials are to match the existing dwelling. Therefore, an additional condition relating to materials would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations, which would indicate that a decision should be made otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR